

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of the State of California
2 DANE R. GILLETTE
Chief Assistant Attorney General
3 JULIE L. GARLAND
Senior Assistant Attorney General
4 ANYA M. BINSACCA
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
5 DENISE A. YATES, State Bar No. 191073
Deputy Attorney General
6 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
7 Telephone: (415) 703-5531
Fax: (415) 703-5843
8 Email: Denise.Yates@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Respondent Ben Curry, Acting Warden
9 at the Correctional Training Facility
SF2007200727

10
11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 OAKLAND DIVISION
14

15 **HUY DANG,**

Petitioner,

17 v.

18 **B. CURRY, Warden,**

19 Respondent.

No. C 07-3845 SBA (PR)

**RESPONDENT'S REPLY TO
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO
DISMISS**

21 Petitioner Dang challenges the Board of Parole Hearings' 2006 decision denying him
22 parole. Respondent moved to dismiss Dang's habeas petition because he did not exhaust his
23 state court remedies for one of his claims. Specifically, Dang did not allege in his California
24 Supreme Court petition for review his claim that the Board's denial violated his Sixth
25 Amendment right to trial by jury. Dang's contentions in opposition are without merit, and this
26 Court should grant Respondent's Motion to Dismiss.

27 First, Dang contends that because he referenced the Sixth Amendment in the
28 memorandum of points and authorities supporting his federal petition, he was not asserting a

1 separate claim. Dang's contention is belied by the conclusion to his memorandum of points and
2 authorities where he alleges: "A parole denial of such a nature it [sic] violated Petitioner's
3 constitutional rights to due process under the 5th and 14th Amendments of the United States
4 Constitution and his 6th Amendment right to trial by jury." (Pet. 18.) Although Dang may be
5 relying on the same facts, he is clearly alleging a violation of his Sixth Amendment rights
6 separate from a violation of his due process rights.

7 Second, Dang contends that he raised the Sixth Amendment claim in his petition for
8 review to the California Supreme Court, but it was included in his memorandum of points and
9 authorities that Respondent allegedly did not provide to this Court. Dang's petition for review
10 appears complete as Respondent provided in exhibit one to his Motion to Dismiss and does not
11 reference a separate memorandum of points and authorities. Moreover, if it exists, Dang should
12 have provided a copy of the memorandum of points and authorities to meet his burden of proving
13 he exhausted his remedies. *Williams v. Craven*, 460 F.2d 1253, 1254 (9th Cir. 1972) (per
14 curiam).

15 Third, Dang contends that he exhausted the Sixth Amendment claim because it was
16 included in his state appellate court petition. Dang's contention fails because even if he did
17 allege it there, his petition for review must be complete and he may not incorporate his appellate
18 court petition by reference. Cal. Ct. R. 8.504(e)(3).

19 Finally, Dang contends that he intended to raise the Sixth Amendment claim in his
20 petition for review because it was listed in his table of contents and was erroneously omitted
21 from his corresponding argument. In the table of contents, Dang only contends that the Board
22 violated his "5th, 6th, and 14th Amendment Constitutional Right to Due Process." (Mot. to
23 Dismiss, Ex. 1 at i.) But as noted above, in his federal petition, Dang clearly alleges that the
24 Board's decision violated his "6th Amendment right to trial by jury." (Pet. 18.) Thus, what Dang
25 intended to exhaust in his petition for review is not the same claim he asserts in his federal
26 petition.

27 In summary, Dang alleges a violation of his Sixth Amendment right to trial by jury in his
28 federal petition, and he did not fairly present that claim to the California Supreme Court in his

1 petition for review. Thus, Dang has not met his burden of proving that he exhausted that federal
2 claim before filing this habeas petition, and this Court must dismiss this mixed petition. *Pliler v.*
3 *Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 227 (2004) (citing *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 510 (1982)).

4 Dated: November 28, 2007

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of the State of California

7 DANE R. GILLETTE
Chief Assistant Attorney General

8 JULIE L. GARLAND
Senior Assistant Attorney General

9 ANYA M. BINSACCA
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

10
11 
12

13 DENISE A. YATES
Deputy Attorney General

14 Attorneys for Respondent Ben Curry, Acting Warden at
15 the Correctional Training Facility
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL

Case Name: **Dang v. Curry**

No.: **U. S. D. C., N. D., OAKLAND DIV., C07-03845 SBA**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On **November 28, 2007**, I served the attached

RESPONDENT'S REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS

by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004, addressed as follows:

Huy Dang, H-40124
Correctional Training Facility
P.O. Box 689
Soledad, CA 93960-0689
in pro per

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on **November 28, 2007**, at San Francisco, California.

J. Baker

Declarant


Signature